

ARTICLE APPROVED
ON PAGE EDWASHINGTON TIMES
26 March 1986

LaRouche under the Ultrascope

JOHN SEILER

Who the heck is Lyndon LaRouche, the guy whose followers last week ambushed the Democratic Party in Illinois?

The *Chicago Tribune* calls Mr. LaRouche a "right-wing extremist" and an "ultraconservative." *The New York Times* dubs him "an eccentric far-rightist and anti-Communist." And *The Washington Post* labels his followers "far-right." These names come from news stories, not editorial page broadsides.

By posting Mr. LaRouche on the extreme right of the political spectrum, these newspapers accomplish two things, consciously or unconsciously. They taint Ronald Reagan and other conservatives long branded "ultraconservative." And they absolve liberals and Democrats from their current, unwanted LaRouche connections — perhaps hoping to get their friends out of a mess. But such continued confusion only compounds the problem, as I shall explain later. Again, who the heck is Lyndon LaRouche?

Over the years, Lyndon LaRouche's political stance has gyrated wildly. Yet the fact remains that Mr. LaRouche has always been an extreme leftist, who uses techniques first outlined and practiced by his idol, Vladimir Ilyich Lenin. Mr. LaRouche is no conservative — "ultra" or otherwise.

True, Mr. LaRouche supports the development of laser "beam" weapons to knock down ICBMs. But so do Mikhail Gorbachev and (presumably) Deng Xiaoping, neither of whom is a conservative. More, Mr. LaRouche's followers have denounced Gen. Daniel Graham, head of High Frontier, the main group supporting just such a space defense, and one of the main influences on President Reagan's decision to build the Strategic Defense Initiative.

It's also true that Mr. LaRouche makes a big deal of the current AIDS epidemic. But so do the Soviets, who

blame the disease on CIA biological warfare experiments gone awry. (Indeed, Mr. LaRouche's biological theories rival in bizarre ness those of late Soviet biologist Trofim Lysenko.)

Mr. LaRouche also declares that the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings balanced budget act will hurt the poor, and so should be repealed — a clearly liberal position. Yet neither should we go to the opposite extreme and label Mr. LaRouche a "liberal." Other definitions are needed.

Writing in *National Review* in 1979, a former LaRouche associate reported that the LaRouche-affiliated National Caucus of Labor Committees has ties to Soviet officials. And a Heritage Foundation report concluded that Mr. LaRouche takes positions "which in the end advance Soviet foreign policy goals. . . . In the worst case, [the LaRouche group] may well be the strangest asset for the KGB's disinformation effort." We're getting closer to a definition here. *Tribune* columnist Mike Royko refers to Mr. LaRouche as "ultra-weird." But even this accurate epithet misses the point.

Lyndon LaRouche is in fact a Leninist-Trotskyite, with a dash of anti-Semitism thrown in. This takes a bit of explaining.

According to a report on Mr. LaRouche released in 1985 by Mid-Atlantic Research Associates (MARA), "In 1948 . . . LaRouche joined the Trotskyist Communist So-

cialist Workers Party (SWP), the U.S. section of the Brussels-based United Secretariat of the Fourth International, and then adopted the 'party name' Lyn Marcus" — a play on the names Lenin and Marx. The MARA report adds: "LaRouche/Marcus left the Socialist Workers Party in 1957," but "remained in Trotskyist Communist circles."

To understand Mr. LaRouche, one must therefore understand both Leninism and Trotskyism.

As Arnold Beichman wrote in this newspaper last month, "Leninism is a theory of power, how to grab it, how to keep it, and how to concentrate it in an oligarchy anointed by a sacred and presumably immutable ideology." Mr. Beichman calls Leninism "the only new political idea of the 20th century," with its central apparatus, "the totalitarian party."

Both Mussolini and Hitler readily molded their respective Fascist and National Socialist parties on the Leninist model; and Hitler openly admired Stalin's adept use of Leninist political technique. And though these tyrants appealed to nationalist sentiments, they were no more "rightists" than the Soviets are today when they appeal to the Soviet "fatherland." Likewise, Mr. LaRouche's anti-Semitism stands up although Trotsky was Jewish, as are even some LaRouchists; one doesn't expect consistency from the "ultra-weird."

Trotskyism is a kind of hyper-Leninism. In a memo penned in 1921, Lenin insisted that "revolution consists of a series of accelerations, sudden brakes, attacks, truces, and periods of relative calm, during which the power of the revolution reinforces itself and prepares itself for final victory. . . ." Such delays were too slow for Lenin's revolutionary army commander, Leon Trotsky, who always pumped for instant world revolution. The best example of Trotskyism in action was Mao Tse-tung's policy of continuous revolution (since superceded by the gradualism of current Chinese dictator Deng Xiaoping, a true Leninist).

Let's see how Mr. LaRouche meets these two definitions.

First, his political group clearly

fits the Leninist model. Mr. LaRouche has concentrated absolute power in himself and top organization leaders. His political pronouncements are declared immutable, even though, like Lenin, Mr. LaRouche frequently changes them. As Mr. LaRouche has demonstrated in Illinois, he is very adept in the methods of grabbing power. And as any good Leninist party should have, Mr. LaRouche has developed targets of intense hatred, most of

2.

them actually *conservatives*: William F. Buckley Jr., Gen. Graham, *Information Digest* publisher John Rees, The Heritage Foundation, the editor of this newspaper, Arnaud de Borchgrave, and Queen Elizabeth II of England.

Second, the LaRouche group's Trotskyite nature is equally clear. Indeed, Mr. LaRouche's call to instant revolution better fits the United States — the country of instant coffee and microwave ovens — than do the dull pronouncements of the stodgy old Communist Party, U.S.A. The FBI's 1974 annual report said that Mr. LaRouche's National Caucus of Labor Committees is "a violence-oriented organization which has described itself as an 'organization of revolutionary socialists' . . . While the efforts of the organization to weaken other Communist, Trotskyist, and socialist groups through physical attacks on their members at gatherings have all but failed, the impact of these attacks has bolstered its contention that it is necessary to use violence to achieve socialism."

This leaves one question: does Mr. LaRouche still hold to these beliefs?

He seems to have shifted to the right — or so the national media report. In fact, as far as I can tell, Mr. LaRouche has never renounced his

old belief in extreme socialist policies. Presumably, he still believes all the old Marxist economic whimsy taught by both Lenin and Trotsky. A President LaRouche would seize all business concerns, and organize agriculture around huge collective farms. We would see an American rerun of Chairman Mao's Great Leap Forward of the late 1950s. And as Trotsky was always big on advancing Bolshevik culture, we would probably see a rerun of Mao's 1960s Cultural Revolution as well.

As I mentioned, liberal Democrats may hope to confuse things by labeling the LaRouchists "ultra-conservative." But in fact this only compounds the Democrats' problems. Mr. LaRouche is a passing phenomenon, a political Halley's Comet. Even the LaRouchists' violent acts have been, and will be, taken care of by the proper law enforcement agencies.

But the Democrats' current myopia on political extremism will, apparently, continue. Democrats are now applying their foreign policy of ignorance and appeasement to American national politics — a kind of domestic moral equivalence. And this means more losses at the polls.

Illinois Democrats are now learning what happens to the politically complacent. It may take a similar shock to teach national Democrats the same lesson.

John Seiler is a member of the editorial staff of The Washington Times.